

Appl. No. 10/085,486  
Amdt. dated April 13, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of Dec. 14, 2004

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In view of both the amendments presented above and the following discussion, the applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application is obvious under the provisions of 35 USC §§ 102 and 103. Furthermore, the applicants also submit that all of these claims now satisfy the requirements of 35 USC § 112. Thus, the applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

If the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues in any of the claims now pending in the application, the Examiner is urged to telephone Ms. Alberta A. Vitale, Esq., at (203) 469-8097 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Claim Amendments

By the present response, claims 1, 11, 15, 16, 18 and 20 have been amended. Also, claims 2, 3, 4, 12, 13, 14 and 23 have been cancelled.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office action, at page 2, paragraph 2, states that:

Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite . . . The term `parallel

mobile networks' is not specifically defined in the specification of the instant application. Appropriate correction is required. Examiner assumes 'parallel mobile networks' has the same meaning as 'mobile networks'.

In response, the Applicants have now appropriately amended claims 1 and 11 to clarify that the first network and the second network operate in parallel. Support for the amendment is found in Fig. 2 and in the specification generally, and specifically at page 4, lines 17-18, and page 6, line 8 to page 7, line 6.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

1. Claims 1-3, 8-10 and 20

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 8-10 18, and 20 under the provisions of 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated over the teachings in the Haumont patent application (United States patent application US 2001/0019951 filed by applicant Sergo Haumont et al. on December 28, 2000 (hereinafter Haumont)). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

By the amendments made herein to claim 1, incorporating the limitations of claims 2-4, the rejection, with respect to claims 1 and 8-10 is overcome. Likewise, by the amendments made herein to claim 11, incorporating the limitations of claims 12-14, with respect to claims 18 and 20, the rejection is overcome.

2. Claim 23

The Examiner has rejected claim 23 under the provisions of 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated over the teachings in the Schwartz patent (United States patent 6,243,739 issued to Bruce V. Schwartz et al. on June 5, 2001 (hereinafter Schwartz)). In response to the rejection Applicants have cancelled claim 23.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 4-7, 14-17, 19, and 21-22 under the provisions of 35 USC § 103 as being obvious over the teachings in Haumont in view of Schwartz. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

1. Claims 1 and 11

In the interest of prosecution efficiency, Applicants address the rejection of claims 4 and 14 as incorporated into amended independent claims 1 and 11 respectfully. The remaining claims depend from claims 1 or 11 directly or indirectly.

Amended independent claims 1 is drawn to a "[m]ethod of transferring a message stored in a computer arrangement (12) to a mobile device (17(i)), comprising: . . . sending said message from said computer arrangement (12) to a protocol translator (14) using a third protocol, translating said message in said third protocol to a

message in said second protocol before transmission to said mobile device (17(i))." (Emphasis added).

Amended independent claim 11 is drawn to a "[c]ommunication system . . . the communication system further comprising a protocol translator (14), wherein said computer arrangement (12) is arranged to send said message to said protocol translator (14) using a third protocol and said protocol translator is arranged to translate said message in said third protocol to a message in said second protocol before transmission to said mobile device (17(i))." (Emphasis added).

Regarding the "third protocol", the Examiner states, at pages 5-6, paragraph 8 of the Office action, that:

Haumont does not disclose said message from said computer arrangement to a protocol translator using a third protocol.

Schwartz discloses a method of transferring a message stored in a computer arrangement or server (Figure 1, 51) to a mobile device (Figure 1, 11), comprising: transmitting an alert message from said computer arrangement to said mobile device via a first mobile network (Figure 1, 1; column 3, lines 42-51; column 10, lines 22-34; column 10, line 56 - column 11, line 7; column 11, lines 15-23); transmitting said message stored in said computer arrangement (Figure 1, 51) to said mobile device (Figure 1, 11) upon

request from said mobile device (see Abstract) via a second mobile network (Figure 1, 40); wherein both said first and second networks belong in part to the same physical network.

Wherein Schwartz further discloses sending said message from said computer arrangement to a protocol translator (inherently in computer, Figure 1, 31) using a third protocol (UDP/IP), translating said message in said third protocol to a message in said second protocol before transmission to said mobile device (column 5, lines 10-21; column 6, lines 54-64).

Applicants note that the third protocol used by Schwartz according to the Examiner is UDP/IP. The protocol converter, which according to the Examiner is "inherently [present] in [the] computer," translates the message from the third protocol to a second protocol before transmission to said mobile device.

Applicants note that the Schwartz UDP/IP is a transport protocol and not a message protocol as used in Applicants' invention. Therefore from Schwartz it cannot be learned that a message in a third protocol is translated into a message in a second protocol; Schwartz merely teaches that a message can be sent using different transport protocols while leaving the message in its original protocol format.

Since, as admitted in the Office action, Haumont does not disclose the message from the computer arrangement

Appl. No. 10/085,486  
Amdt. dated April 13, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of Dec. 14, 2004

to a protocol translator using a third protocol, and Schwartz, for the above stated reasons does not teach Applicants translating a message in a third protocol into a message in a second protocol, Applicants invention is not taught or suggested by the Haumont or Schwartz, individually, or in combination.

2. Claims 5-10 and 15-22

For the reasons stated above with respect to claims 1 and 11, from which claims 5-10 and 15-22 depend, respectively, claims 5-10 and 15-22 are not obvious.

Conclusion

Thus, the Applicants submit that none of the claims, presently in the application, is anticipated under the provisions of 35 USC § 102 or obvious under the provisions of 35 USC § 103. Furthermore, the Applicant(s) also submit that all of these claims now fully satisfy the requirements of 35 USC § 112.

Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/085,486  
Amdt. dated April 13, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of Dec. 14, 2004



Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

April 13, 2004

Peter L. Michaelson, Attorney  
Customer No. 007265  
Reg. No. 30,090  
(732) 530-6671

MICHAELSON & ASSOCIATES  
Counselors at Law  
Parkway 109 Office Center  
328 Newman Springs Road  
P.O. Box 8489  
Red Bank, New Jersey 07701

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING under 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on **April 14, 2005** with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Signature

30,090

Reg. No.

(PTT136CIPRCEAMEND/ca:146)